



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/688,098	10/17/2003	David T. Zwolinski	85939.000298	9084

23387 7590 01/25/2005

Stephen B. Salai, Esq.
Harter, Secrest & Emery LLP
1600 Bausch & Lomb Place
Rochester, NY 14604-2711

EXAMINER

STRIMBU, GREGORY J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3634

DATE MAILED: 01/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/688,098

Applicant(s)

ZWOLINSKI ET AL.

Examiner

Gregory J. Strimbu

Art Unit

3634

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 November 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 and 32-90 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 32-39 and 51-90 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 and 40-50 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 November 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election of Group I in the reply filed on November 12, 2004 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)). Accordingly, claims 32-39 and 51-90 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on November 12, 2004.

Drawings

The corrected drawings filed on November 12, 2004 have been approved.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language:

Claims 1, 5, 7, 9, 13, 14, 17, 18, 20-23, 25-30 and 40-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Coldre et al. Coldre et al. discloses a vehicular weatherseal comprising a rigid polymeric backbone F, E having a flange engaging

Art Unit: 3634

channel 10 and window receiving channel (not numbered, but shown in figure 4a), the window receiving channel being inverted relative to the flange engaging channel and defined by a substantially curvilinear cross section (as shown in figure 4a), the window receiving channel includes a window channel closed end (not numbered, but shown in figure 4a) having a varying radius of curvature, a linear segment (not numbered, but shown in figure 4a connecting the window receiving channel to the flange engaging channel), a sealing lip 15, a trim lip (not numbered, but shown in figure 4a), the backbone may be monolithic (see page 2, paragraph 21).

It should be noted that a window receiving channel has no set definition in art. Therefore, the window receiving channel can comprise all to only a portion of the element E as shown in figure 4.

Since claim 49 recites no more than process steps, it has been treated as a process by product claim and is therefore anticipated by the product as set forth above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coldre et al. as applied to claims 1, 5, 7, 9, 13, 14, 17, 18, 20-23, 25-30 and 40-50

Art Unit: 3634

above. Coldre et al. is silent concerning an inner radius of curvature to thickness ratio for the window channel closed end.

However, one of ordinary skill in the art is expected to routinely experiment with parameters so as to ascertain the optimum or workable ranges for a particular use. Accordingly, it would have been no more than an obvious matter of engineering design choice, as determined through routine experimentation and optimization, for one of ordinary skill to provide the window channel closed end with an inner radius of curvature to thickness ratio greater than approximately 1 but less than approximately 2.5 to ensure the edge of the window properly seals against the weatherseal.

Claims 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coldre et al. as applied to claims 1, 5, 7, 9, 13, 14, 17, 18, 20-23, 25-30 and 40-50 above. Coldre et al. is silent concerning the particular inner radius of curvature to thickness ratio for the flange channel closed end.

However, one of ordinary skill in the art is expected to routinely experiment with parameters so as to ascertain the optimum or workable ranges for a particular use. Accordingly, it would have been no more than an obvious matter of engineering design choice, as determined through routine experimentation and optimization, for one of ordinary skill to provide the flange channel closed end with a radius of curvature to thickness ratio of approximately 1 but less than approximately 2.5 to ensure the edge of the window properly seals against the weatherseal.

Art Unit: 3634

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coldre et al. as applied to claims 1, 5, 7, 9, 13, 14, 17, 18, 20-23, 25-30 and 40-50 above, and further in view of Keeney et al. Keeney et al. disclose a weatherseal comprising an elongation reducing member 72.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Coldre et al. with an elongation reducing member, as taught by Keeney et al., to increase the strength of the weatherseal.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coldre et al. as applied to claims 1, 5, 7, 9, 13, 14, 17, 18, 20-23, 25-30 and 40-50 above, and further in view of Thies. Thies discloses a vehicular weatherseal comprising a window receiving channel 2 having a constant radius of curvature.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Coldre et al. with a constant radius of curvature, as taught by Thies, to better grip both sides of the windowpane.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coldre et al. as applied to claims 1, 5, 7, 9, 13, 14, 17, 18, 20-23, 25-30 and 40-50 above, and further in view of Mesnel et al. Mesnel et al. discloses a vehicular weatherseal comprising a flange channel closed end 1 having constant radius of curvature as shown in figure 1.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Coldre et al. with a constant radius of curvature, as taught by Mesnel et al., to ensure that the flange channel securely engages the flange of the vehicle.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coldre et al. in view of Thies as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Mesnel et al. Mesnel et al. discloses a vehicular weatherseal comprising a flange channel closed end 1 having constant radius of curvature as shown in figure 1.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Coldre et al., as modified above, with a constant radius of curvature, as taught by Mesnel et al., to ensure that the flange channel securely engages the flange of the vehicle.

Claims 1, 5, 6 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over European Patent Publication No. 0 367 731 in view of Dover. European Patent Publication No. 0 367 731 discloses a vehicular weatherseal comprising a flange engaging channel 10 and a window receiving channel 13, the window receiving channel being inverted relative to the flange engaging channel and defined by a substantially curvilinear cross section as shown in figure 2, having a varying radius of curvature and a constant wall thickness defined by the wall 13. European Patent Publication No. 0 367 731 is silent concerning a rigid polymeric backbone.

However, Dover discloses a weatherseal comprising polymeric backbone 42.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide European Patent Publication No. 0 367 731 with a polymeric backbone, as taught by Dover, to increase the strength of the weatherseal.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed November 12, 2004 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. The applicant has amended claim 1 to include the further limitation of a "substantially curvilinear cross section. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 3634

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory J. Strimbu whose telephone number is 703-305-3979. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:00 to 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lanna Mai can be reached on 703-308-2486. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Gregory J. Strimbu", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Gregory J. Strimbu
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3634
January 18, 2004